Ext. 1120/1 1303-1327
OFFICE OF THE ... RURAL EXTENSION TRAINING CENTRE BHAVANAGAR

CPA Series No. 13-A.

S. N. 72

सत्यमेव जयते

11/1303

NATIONAL EXTENSION SERVICE

AND

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

EXT. 112/1

…rative Organisation at the Block,
…sion, District and State Levels)

COMMUNITY PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
January 1956

EXT-112/1

EXT-112
(

D.O. No. PS/CP-938.

October 8, 1953.

My dear

The Community Projects Administration from time to time has written to Development Commissioners on the subject of the administrative organisation for the implementation of the Community Development Programme. Particular attention is invited in this connection to letter No. CPA/163/52, dated the 29th April, 1953, regarding the organisation of a National Extension Service and Expansion of the Community Development Programme. A copy of the pamphlet in which this letter has been reproduced is attached.* Paragraph 10 of the note attached to the letter, contains the recommendations of the Planning Commission regarding the basic organisational pattern to be followed, subject to local adaptations and variations.

2. Recent discussions with State Government officials, at the meeting of the State Ministers of Agriculture and Directors of Agriculture held by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, from 22nd to 28th September, 1953, indicate that there is still a certain amount of misunderstanding regarding the role of the Development Commissioner in bringing about co-ordination among the different Development Departments in the State and the part which these Development Departments have to play in the implementation of the Programme. As a result of discussions which took place at the Conference, the doubts entertained by some of the officers have been clarified. A relevant extract from the minutes of the Conference on subject No. 1, dealing with the role of Agriculture Department in the formation of a National Extension Service, is enclosed.

3. There has also been some exchange of correspondence on this subject between Shri R. K. Patil, Minister of Planning and Development, Madhya Pradesh and Shri V. T. Krishnamachari, Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission. A copy of Shri Krishnamachari's letter, dated 16th September, 1953, together with a copy of the relevant extracts from Shri R. K. Patil's letter, are also enclosed.

4. The pattern which has been suggested to the State Governments for adoption in the communications referred to above, is based on the recommendations of the Planning Commission in Chapter VII of their Report and the recommendations contained in Chapter VI of the Grow More Food Enquiry Committee's Report. The essential point is that there is no intention whatever to establish a new Department or hierarchy. To set up any such new organisation would be totally opposed to the fundamental ideas underlying the movement. The Development Commissioner should not create a development agency or department of his own, but should regard himself as the head of a team consisting of the heads of all Development Departments in the State like Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Co-operation, Health and Education. He is the 'head' to ensure that there is co-ordinated and unified approach by the heads of departments mentioned in the implementation of the Five-Year Plan and the activities in the N.E. Blocks and Community Projects. It is intended that for the purpose

*Not printed. Copies already supplied to the State Governments.

of bringing about co-ordination at different levels of the Administration, there should be a single line organisation consisting of:—

Chief Secretary and/or Development Commissioner
|
District Officer
|
Sub-Divisional Officer
|
Block Development Officer
|
Village Level Worker

At the District, Sub-Divisional and Block levels also, the principle of unified approach as a team should be emphasized.

The basic object, therefore, is to transform the existing General Administrative Services into Development Services, and *not* to create a separate Development Service. The machinery of General Administration will have to be re-organised and reoriented in order that it may handle effectively the programme of development of a Welfare State. The only structural change that is taking place is the addition of one or two missing links at the end of the chain in the form of the Block Development Officer and the Village Level Worker who is the multi-purpose representative of the Development Departments *vis-à-vis* the village.

5. The discussions with the Directors of Agriculture tended to show that there was a feeling in the minds of the technical officers that they were being treated as members of an inferior service not eligible for consideration for promotion to the General Administrative Services which will be the co-ordinating agency of the entire administration for development purposes. It is essential in the interest of the generation of a proper team spirit, that this feeling should be removed. The observation made by Shri Krishnamachari in paragraph 2 of his letter is of particular importance in this connection. I would also invite your attention to the communication recently issued to the State Governments regarding recruitment of Block Development Officers (letter No. CPA/165/53, dated 18th September, 1953, from the Community Projects Administration to all State Governments). The exact manner of implementation of Shri Krishnamachari's suggestion regarding reinforcement of the services at different levels by men of exceptionally good qualifications may kindly be considered by you.

6. To sum up, the main features of the Administrative Organisation, as visualized by the Planning Commission, will be as follows:—

(*i*) The basic function of the Development Commissioner is to *co-ordinate* the activities of the various Development Departments and to see that they work towards the fulfilment of the overall plan for the State. It follows from this that the Development Commissioner should not set up an independent Development Department, but should regard himself as the head of a team, consisting of the Heads of the different Development Departments in the State like Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Panchayat, Co-operation, Health, Education, etc.

(*ii*) To achieve co-ordination at the District, Sub-Divisional and Block (approximately 100 villages) levels, functions similar to

those of the Development Commissioner will have to be discharged by the District Officer, Sub-Divisional Officer and the Block Development Officer respectively. (N.E.S. and C.P. Blocks should be so selected that three or four of them, taken together, coincide with the revenue administrative division.)

(*iii*) The multi-purpose Village Level Worker should be regarded as the last link in this administrative chain and should be treated as a part of the District Administration, and not of any separate Department. In some States, *e.g.*, Bombay, the Village Level Worker is also being given training in revenue work with a view to using him also for revenue administration. As the burden of development work which will fall on the V.L.W. will be heavy in the initial stages, States may find it necessary for the present to keep the V.L.W. free from revenue functions, although at a later stage it may be possible for him to combine revenue functions with development functions.

(*iv*) Above the village level, technical officers should, wherever possible, belong to the different Development Departments, but should be subject to the supervision for purposes of co-ordination of the General Administrative Officer of the appropriate level, *viz.*, Block Development Officer at the Block level, S.D.O. at the Sub-Divisional level, and the District Officer at the District level. While the V.L.W. will form a part of the general administrative staff of the District and will be directly under the administrative control of the District Officer, in technical matters, he will receive instructions and guidance from the technical officers at the Block, Sub-Divisional, District and State levels.

(*v*) The General Administrative Services which will be in charge of this vital work of co-ordination, should be reinforced at different levels by intake of men of exceptionally good qualifications and ability from outside, including the various technical departments. As an initial step in this direction, in the selection of Block Development Officers, the suggestions made in letter No. CPA/165/53, dated 18th September, 1953, may be followed to the extent possible.

(*vi*) Inter-service promotions and transfers should become more common than have hitherto been the case. For example, the Village Level Worker should be considered for promotion not only to the post of Block Development Officer, but if he shows greater aptitude for technical work than for administrative work, he should also be considered for promotion in the different Development Departments like Agriculture, Co-operation, Animal Husbandry, Social Education, etc. Similarly, at higher levels, technical officers should be considered for promotion to the General Administrative Services and for holding posts normally filled up by officers of one or other of the General Administrative Service Cadres.

(*vii*) In order to give the necessary re-orientation to the general administrative personnel, it will be necessary:

(*a*) to provide for training in development work for new recruits at the beginning of their careers; and

(*b*) to give a short orientation course of about six weeks to existing administrative personnel.

I am discussing the details of this with the Ministry of Home Affairs and a separate communication on this will follow.

7. I shall be grateful if you will kindly circulate copies of this letter to all your Heads of Departments and District Officers. I feel that such misunderstandings, as may exist on the subject, should be cleared at the outset. You may also find it useful to discuss this at a meeting of your Secretariat Officers and Heads of Departments and also at a conference of District Officers.

8. This letter has been approved by the Planning Commission.

Yours sincerely,

S. K. Dey.

To

All Chief Secretaries to State Governments.

RELEVANT EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE STATE MINISTERS CONFERENCE HELD ON 25TH SEPTEMBER, 1953.

SUBJECT NO. 1.—*Role of Agriculture Department in the formation of the National Extension Service.*

While there was agreement on the point that the message to the farmer should be given through one single agency there was a general feeling that any agency created for co-ordinating extension work should not develop into a separate department to the exclusion of other Development Departments like Agriculture, etc.

As desired by the Ministers, the subject was discussed again by the officials in the afternoon. There was considerable discussion on the pattern of co-ordinating extension work in the different States and the administrative arrangements required for ensuring integration of effort to carry out the plan. There was agreement that there should be a Development Commissioner at the top to co-ordinate the work of different Development Departments in executing the work in Project areas and National Extension Blocks. There was also agreement that work at the ground level should be done through multi-purpose Village Level Workers. There was further agreement that such Village Level Workers instead of being administratively controlled by different Development Departments should be subject to the control of the District Officer, namely, the District Magistrate or Deputy Commissioner. It was agreed that as specialist departments would have a great role to play in rendering technical advice in the execution of extension work in the National Extension Blocks and Project areas, the office of the Development Commissioner should not expand into a separate Development Department to the exclusion of other Development Departments. The view was also expressed that in course of time with further progress in the country's development, the present type of Village Level Worker might have to be replaced by specialist in each subject. This being so, technical officers above the Village Level Worker should be under the control and guidance of the Development Departments like Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, etc. It was emphasised that a system of reporting on the work of the different officers concerned with the planning and execution of development work should be devised to see that each officer performs his duties efficiently.

The following suggestions were made for approval by the Ministers:—

(*i*) Co-ordination of developmental work in the Project areas or National Extension Blocks may continue to be done through a Development Commissioner. His functions would primarily be co-ordination at higher level to ensure that the plan of developmental work envisaged in a Project area, Extension Block, etc., is carried out according to the plan by the integrated effort of all the Development Departments concerned. It follows, that the office of the Development Commissioner should not grow up into a separate department to the exclusion of other development like the Departments of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, etc.

(*ii*) Message to the villager should not be conveyed through different staff of the different Development Departments but through a trained multi-purpose Village Level Worker.

(*iii*) Village Level Workers should not be administratively under the control of the different Development Departments but should be subordinate to the District Officer, *viz.*, District Magistrate or Deputy Commissioner.

(*iv*) Planning of a composite programme of development in a Community Project area, Extension Block, etc., should be done consistent with any overall plan for the State by the District Officer in charge of such work in consultation with the Development Departments concerned.

(*v*) As most of the village improvement measures relate to improved farm techniques, it will be essential that the work done at ground level by the Village Level Workers is technically supervised by the staff of the different Development Departments like the Department of Agriculture which would require to be strengthened wherever necessary.

(*vi*) As the success of developmental measures in the Project Areas and National Extension Blocks would largely depend on the measure of co-operation between the District Officers in charge of the work and the officers of the Development Departments for rendering advice and technical supervision there is need for evolving a suitable system of assessing the contribution which an officer makes towards the successful execution of the work. For this purpose, the District Magistrate or the Deputy Commissioner should be given an opportunity to report on the work of the District heads of sections of Development Departments in the district and technical officers who serve in an advisory capacity. Similarly, the Heads of Development Departments should be in a position to report on the work of the District Officers, (including one District Magistrate or Deputy Commissioner) in charge of planning and execution of extension work in the district in so far as their developmental activities are concerned.

(*vii*) * * * * * *

(*viii*) With regard to supplies, the technical departments should continue their normal effort in all areas including Project areas. For instance, with regard to the supply of seed, they would produce the quantity of improved seed they would have ordinarily produced even if a Project had not been opened under a separate agency but the Project staff in the Project areas should be in a position to multiply their seeds on their own effort for intensifying work in the Project instead of depending merely on the technical department for all supplies they require. The Agriculture Department should supply nucleus seed.

(*ix*) * * * * * *

(*x*) As an incentive to attract and retain in service suitable Village Level Workers, conditions of service should be laid down so as to enable the Village Level Workers to rise, on consideration of merit, to higher positions such as Block-level Officers, etc.

33/1, Civil Lines, Nagpur.

Dated the 16th September, 1953.

My dear Shri Krishnamachari,

* * * * * *

2. You will recall that there were some differences as to the precise form this extension service should take. There was a general agreement as to the great necessity of its co-ordination with the main administrative services, *i.e.*, the revenue cadre but what precise form the co-ordination should take was a matter for some difference of opinion. You felt that the revenue cadre should itself be transformed into an extension cadre and the Deputy Commissioner and the Sub-Divisional Officers should be Extension Officers and to enable them to do so they may be given assistance for doing their routine duties. Another view was that while the responsibility for development should be squarely put on the Collector and other revenue officers, the extension service should be a combined cadre of the Development Departments working under the Deputy Commissioner and in close collaboration with him. In this view of the matter the extension officer will be responsible to the Deputy Commissioner and working under him but will not necessarily be drawn from the revenue agency and would ordinarily be drawn from the combined cadre of the Development Departments. In the Five-Year Plan when we referred to this question, we were not quite agreed in this respect and left the choice to the State Governments.

3. I am not now concerned here about the respective merits and demerits of the two forms of organisations of the extension service referred to above. I am more concerned to secure that whatever form the future extension service might take, it should not assume the characteristic and form of a new Government department with all its old traditions. It should not develop into a routine administration. It must be a vigorous new service live and kicking all the time. It will then alone succeed in attacking this vast human problem as we have put it. The question before me is how do we secure this in the present set-up in the States. Before discussing this question I think it is necessary to discuss why our present administration has become routine. It is then alone that our attention could be concentrated on avoiding those causes and circumstances which make it so. I believe that our administration lacks really the will and zest for development and has become routine on account of the following causes:—

(*a*) The absence of real administrative leadership at different levels.

(*b*) The absence of a clear division of functions, responsibilities and duties at different levels.

(*c*) Lack of sufficient decentralisation with authority and power to take decisions in conformity with (*b*) above.

(*d*) Failure of proper evaluation of the work of different officers with the result that promotion is generally on seniority and length of service rather than on proved merit. In fact, as a rule, seniority is assumed to carry with it the qualities required for promotion except in the case of some defects in the officer. This encourages caution and a routine approach to the administration but no special zeal in the discharge of undertaken responsibilities.

(e) Lack of mobility in our Government cadres. We do not and cannot shift a man from one post for which he is not particularly suited to another post where he may be more suited. The result is that unless he is so bad as to be dismissed, he continues to be as an indifferent specimen till retirement.

(f) The unconscious slackness that often occurs in Government service by the very security that it offers. This can only be counteracted by a sufficient scope for promotion to the zealous and hard-working, and a weeding out and transfer of those who are found wanting.

* * * * * *

* * * * * *

10. The problems as I see are as follows:—

(a) What practical steps do we take to satisfy ourselves that the best personnel is made available for manning the extension service?

(b) Must these officers be selected only from the Revenue Department or should people of comparable categories be taken from other Development Departments?

(c) Would it not be desirable that all selected persons should undergo an intensive reorientation in extension methods where their performance would be observed and their suitability for the extension work determined?

(d) Could the necessary staff required for this purpose be placed at the disposal of the State Government? Would this not form a legitimate expenditure on the National Extension Service Scheme?

(e) How do we provide for sufficient mobility in the extension service unless it is a distinct service from all other departments? People then could be brought into it and taken away from it.

(f) Would not sufficient co-ordination and assistance be available from the Revenue Department if the extension services were not merged with it but put under its direct control and guidance?

(g) What safeguards do we adopt to keep the performance of the extension service at a high pitch? How can they be made practically effective under our existing service conditions?

I should be glad to have your views on the above points at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,
R. K. Patil.

Shri V. T. Krishnamachari,
Deputy Chairman,
Planning Commission,
New Delhi.

D.-O. No. PC/DCH/374/53.

September 21, 1953.

MY DEAR PATIL,

Many thanks for your letter of the 16th on the National Extension Service.

2. I shall first deal *seriatim* with the points you mention under (*a*) to (*f*) in paragraph 3. As you say, the question of leadership at different levels—meaning thereby non-official leadership—is a most difficult one. Quality varies in different areas. The main point is that we have not got a strong middle class which can devote time and energy to honorary work and our recent policies have checked the emergence of such a middle class. Similarly (*d*), (*e*) and (*f*) are matters of administrative policy which apply to the whole field of administration and, as you know, we on the Planning Commission have been devoting a great deal of attention to it. Our official machinery is very rigid and inelastic. The British wanted to maintain it in that way for political reasons. The main aim was to retain "the British character of the service" of which we of an earlier generation heard every day of our official lives. They felt that if there was elasticity and suitable recruits could come in at different levels, it would be impossible to maintain this British character. There is now no need for this rigidity to be maintained; but as most of us have been trained in the old tradition, we regard this as an essential part of the conception of a 'service'. Personally I have always fought for the principle that the services should be reinforced at different levels by men of exceptionally good qualifications in order that there might be increased efficiency. This, as you know, is embodied in the chapters on "Administration" in the Planning Commission's report.

3. Coming now to your own specific problems, we seek co-ordination at the following levels:—

(1) Village level.

(2) Sub-Divisional level; this is Tehsil level in your State.

(3) The District level and above.

In between, *i.e.*, at the level of development blocks, I agree with you that the best men available should be selected from the Revenue and Development Departments, and be enlisted in the cadre of block development officers. The argument that the block development officers recruited from the Development Departments do not know revenue work is not important. They can be trained for it in a short time and while working as block development officers, they will also have opportunities of becoming acquainted with revenue work, if the Sub-Divisional Officer sees that they get this opportunity. Every block development officer should have a chance of rising to the sub-divisional grade exactly in the same manner as those who were originally recruited to the Revenue Department. In other words, the Revenue Department should hereafter have a fair number of qualified men who have done well in Development Departments; and the Development Department officers should have a chance of rising either in the Revenue Department or in their own Department. It follows from this that there should be no wide disparity in salaries in the higher levels of Revenue and Development Departments.

4. You ask how Revenue Officers who do not prove equal to their development duties should be dealt with. My answer is that those who were recruited from the Development Departments should go back to their old departments and that those who were recruited from Revenue Department should be assigned minor duties as Treasury Officers, etc. In an atmosphere of development, if we make our initial choice properly and give proper training, such wastage need not be large.

* * * * * *

6. As regards the grades of Sub-Divisional Officers and above, we get the best of our young men through a competitive examination into the I.A.S., and if in the Training School and elsewhere we impress on them the importance of development work and train them for such work, there is no doubt that they will prove equal to their duties. It will interest you to bear that for the present batch of I.A.S. probationers, we have arranged a series of lectures on all aspects of the Five-Year Plan. The other day, I spoke to them generally on the Plan and invited questions. I found them quite keen and alert and exceedingly anxious to help in the great national effort that is being made.

7. Let me now answer categorically the points you make in paragraph 10:—

(a) I have already given my views on the recruitment to the grade of Village Level Workers and Block Development Officers.

(b) Block Development Officers should be recruited from the Revenue Department, from the Development Departments and from among Village Level Workers.

(c) Certainly.

(d) This reorientation can be given in the National Extension Block and Community Project areas themselves, and in training schools. I do not think that special staff would be necessary for this.

(e) There should be sufficient mobility in all our services, not merely in the extension services. The idea of a rigidly organised service is wrong.

(f) In a Welfare State the main service should be the extension service. There can be no such department as the Revenue Department controlling the extension service.

Our existing service conditions should be modified so as to ensure that promotion goes by merit and not by mere seniority.

With kindest regards,

I am,
Yours sincerely,
V. T. KRISHNAMACHARI.

Shri R. K. Patil,
Minister of Planning and Development,
Government of Madhya Pradesh,
Nagpur.

No. CPA/165/53

COMMUNITY PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

(PLANNING COMMISSION)

New Delhi, September 18, 1953.

To

The Development Commissioners and Directors of Community Projects of all State Governments.

SUBJECT: *Organisation of a National Extension Service and Expansion of the Community Development Programme—Selection of Block Development Officers.*

SIR,

The basic pattern of the administrative organisation for the implementation of the community development programme is indicated in paragraphs 3 and 10 of the note forwarded with letter No. CPA/163/52, dated 29th April, 1953. State Governments are to implement these recommendations to such extent as is possible, with their existing resources in terms of money and trained man power, and with such local variations as may be considered necessary.

2. State Governments may now examine their requirements of additional personnel for posts of Block Development Officers and decide about the manner of recruitment.

The following suggestions are offered for the consideration of State Governments:—

(*a*) The basic object should be to transform the existing Administrative Services into Development Services, and not to create a separate Development cadre. The Block Development Officer at the block level should, therefore, normally belong to one or other of the existing Administrative Services. Having regard to the availability of suitable recruits, State Governments may decide whether these officers should be recruited into the State Civil Service or the Subordinate Civil Service. For this purpose the posts of Block Development Officers may be regarded as temporary additions to either the State Civil Service cadre or the Subordinate Civil Service cadre. The entry may be from three different sources:—

(*i*) From existing members of the State Civil Service or Subordinate Civil Service, as the case may be, who have shown an aptitude for development work. Promising material may also be available in the category of Sub-Registrars.

(*ii*) By open market recruitment, on a temporary basis to begin with. These recruits should be tried out in these jobs and should be confirmed only if they are found suitable after a probationary period of two years.

(*iii*) By promotion from the level of Revenue Officers, Inspectors or Demonstrators in Agriculture Department, Co-operative Department, Animal Husbandry Department, Rural Reconstruction

Department, etc. Village Level Workers and Block-level Workers in Community Projects and National Extension Service Blocks, who have done outstanding work, should also be considered for promotion to the posts of Block Development Officers.

(*iv*) *In addition to these categories*, the possibility of posting new recruits to the Indian Administrative Service as Block Development Officers for a period of one or two years may also be considered. This, it is suggested, will give them very useful training which will qualify them later for the discharge of their duties as Extension Officers for the Sub-Division and the District.

(*b*) Recruitments should be made either by the Public Service Commission or by a Selection Board specially constituted for the purpose. In either case the Development Commissioner or his representative should be associated with the selection. Suitability for development work should be the main criterion for selection.

(*c*) The pay scale, Rs. 250—Rs. 400, is indicated only as a guide and will be varied or adjusted by the State Governments according to the rates of pay applicable to equivalent posts in the State cadre.

3. Will you please examine the above suggestions and indicate your views, especially as to what changes and modifications are necessary in the light of the existing administrative set-up in your State? In the basic pattern of the administrative organisation for the implementation of the Community Development Programme, the Tehsildar (or Circle Officer in West Bengal) has not been brought directly into the picture. Your views as to whether this officer should also be linked with the administrative organisation, and if so, in what manner, will be appreciated.

4. I shall be grateful if you will also indicate what action is being taken in regard to the recruitment of Block Development Officers for the National Extension Service Development Blocks which will be taken up on the 2nd October, 1953, in your State.

5. It is considered that the Block Development Officers and the three Extension Officers (subject matter specialists) for each National Extension Service Block should be given a short course of orientation training. The question whether training centres for this purpose should be established in various parts of the country is under consideration, and a separate communication regarding this will be sent to you later.

Yours faithfully,
U. L. Goswami,
Secretary, C.P.A.

Copies to:

1. The Chief Secretaries to all State Governments.
2. Shri S. B. Bapat, I.C.S.,
   Joint Secretary to the Government of India,
   Ministry of Home Affairs,
   New Delhi.

8PlanComm.—5,000—12-1-56—PP.